

Luke, Tim

WD 34 2002 file

From: Luke, Tim
Sent: Friday, June 07, 2002 11:09 AM
To: Rosenkrance Doug (WD34) (E-mail)
Subject: Letter re Reno Rts

Doug,

Attached is the letter I sent to Stoecklein in 2000 regarding how the Reno rights should be delivered. As I see it and in accordance with the water rights, Reno is limited to a combined rate of diversion of 1.96 cfs between his well right (34-7245B and 34-13555) and his right from the Hatchery Canal (34-470A). Mr. Speck's analysis of how the total use should be limited between the well and Hatchery Canal right seems to be correct. However, if Reno is rotating use of the Hatchery Canal rights with Johnson, Reno could actually use the additional 0.33 cfs under the Johnson right and thus divert from the legal points of diversion a total of 2.29 cfs between the well and the Hatchery Canal rights. The re-diversion from the canal should be given the appropriate loss by the ditchrider pursuant to the stipulated agreement among the parties on the ditch and pursuant to the approved transfers (i.e.; the 21% loss).

I would suggest replying to Speck and stating that you intend to have the rights administered as stated above. I would further suggest stating that the deputy watermaster in the area should monitor the well in conjunction with the canal rights to assure that the 1.96 cfs is not exceeded unless the rotation is occurring. I would also suggest that your staff (Sam?) will again measure the well and the mainline going to Reno's place to assure the authorized water right limit. I think the mainline flow to the Reno place from the well should be pretty static through the season, I believe it goes to a set number of hand and/or wheel lines, correct? If there is more than one condition at the well to Reno's place, Sam and the deputy should measure all conditions so that the deputy can monitor the conditions through the season and know what the approximate flow is at any one time.

Tim



StoecklinLtr4.doc